

Technical Panel Evaluation: Watershed Stewardship

Proposal # 99-0118

Evaluation Criteria	Rank Description	Rank					Comments/ Clarifying Questions
		Low	Med. Low	Medium	Med. High	High	
Ecological/ Biological Benefits	High: Requirements for "Medium" rank are met. Project already has wide community support, and is addressing multiple watershed issues. Implementation objectives are clear, and monitoring program is well developed. Potential for benefits to priority species is high. Ecological and biological benefits are clear and well connected to implementation actions. Project is well linked to ERP goals and provides system-wide benefits.				X		<p>Significant reduction ~ pesticides affecting CALFED species.</p> <p>Important effort although not watershed stewardship based.</p> <p>Addresses high priority WQ issue.</p>
	Medium: Watershed stewardship effort is community based, addresses multiple issues, is coordinated at multiple levels, provides for ongoing implementation, includes monitoring, and increases learning awareness. Project provides some ecological/biological benefit, and efforts may, directly or indirectly, benefit priority species. Project is linked to ERP goals, and provides some system-wide benefit. Project is consistent with ERP goals, and other CALFED objectives and/or other projects.						
	Low: Watershed stewardship effort is not widely supported in the community, or does not address multiple issues. Implementation/Action items are weak, monitoring is inadequate, or educational component is missing. Ecological/Biological benefits are unclear or unrelated (even indirectly) to any priority species. Conflicts exist with ERP goals or other CALFED objectives.						
Technical Feasibility and Timing	High: Requirements for "Medium" rank are met. Project type is of proven feasibility and there are no obstacles to implementation. Project is ready for initiation. There are no remaining implementation issues. Project timing complements or enhances other phases/projects/programs. Participants are already identified and coordinated.				X		
	Medium: Project is technically feasible and no major obstacles to implementation are expected. Proposed tasks are ready to be initiated. Any outstanding implementation issues are identified and addressed. Participants have been identified, but may not yet be involved.						
	Low: Technical feasibility is questionable. Potentially major obstacles to implementation exist. Project tasks are not ready to be initiated. Participants not identified. Serious conflicts between potential participants already exist.						
Monitoring and Data Collection	High: Requirements for "Medium" rank are met. Objectives clearly identified. Detailed monitoring plan already developed, with protocols and parameters identified. Monitoring integrated with other existing programs, if appropriate. Peer review process in place and review organizations identified. Monitoring and data collection information summarized in table.				X		<p>Well established plan w/ peer review.</p> <p>Consider monitoring of tailwater and receiving water or coordination w/ programs already doing the monitoring.</p>

Evaluation Criteria	Rank Description	Rank					Comments/ Clarifying Questions
		Low	Med. Low	Medium	Med. High	High	
	<p>Medium: Objectives identified, and approach to monitoring identified. An appropriate monitoring plan is described, or planned for development as part of the project. Specific monitoring parameters and protocols are identified as appropriate. Coordination with other programs cited. Data evaluation approach and review process addressed. Summary table for biological/ecological objectives provided.</p> <p>11/</p> <p>Low: Objectives unclear or not identified. Monitoring plan and approach unclear or missing. No monitoring parameters identified. Data evaluation approach unclear; no peer review of monitoring data.</p>						
Local Involvement	<p>High: Requirements for "Medium" rank are met. Documentation of local and landowner support provided. Public outreach activities have already occurred or are ongoing. Public outreach plan is in place. Access has been granted, and there are no 3rd party impacts.</p> <p>Medium: Documentation of County notification attached. Other local groups &amp; landowners identified and their level of support indicated. Plan for necessary public outreach described. Written permission for property access or use provided, as applicable. Potential 3rd party impacts identified.</p> <p>Low: County not notified. Local groups or landowners not identified or not supportive. Access uncertain. 3rd party impacts possibly significant.</p>			X			<p>BOS letters from 2 counties (Board of Supervisors) but could involve more stakeholders and did not identify or indicate support of landowners</p> <p>3rd party impacts not well identified.</p>
Cost	<p>High: Requirements for "Medium" rank are met. All requested cost information provided. Project is highly cost effective for the benefits expected, yet costs are realistic for the scope of work. Land ownership/easement issues have been addressed. Administrative costs and functions are clearly described, and administrative costs are a low percentage of overall cost.</p> <p>Medium: Requested cost information is clear and complete, broken down by task as appropriate. Quarterly budgets are provided. Project management costs are specified. Costs appear reasonable for the proposed level of effort. Applicant's resources are used to maximize cost effectiveness. Funding sources for O&amp;M are identified, if necessary. Administrative costs and functions clearly described.</p> <p>Low: Cost information incomplete or insufficiently detailed. Other resources not being used to maximize cost effectiveness. O&amp;M funding sources, if needed, are not identified. Costs appear unreasonably high, or are insufficient, to accomplish the proposed scope of work. Administrative costs not included or unreasonably high.</p>				X		Well documented costs.
Cost Sharing	High: Requirements for "Medium" rank are met. At least half of the project cost is provided from other sources. Commitments from other funding sources are firm.						

Technical Panel Evaluation: Watershed Stewardship

Proposal # C-118

Evaluation Criteria	Rank Description	Rank					Comments/ Clarifying Questions
		Low	Med. Low	Medium	Med. High	High	
Applicant Qualifications	Medium: Other entities and/or applicant(s) sharing in the cost are identified. Some cost share, or in-kind services, are provided. Status of other funding commitments is indicated, and any relevant cost-sharing requirements disclosed.				X		25% committed funds by others → under 50% target but well secured.
	Low: No cost share or in-kind services are provided.						
	High: Requirements for "Medium" rank are met. Individuals or organizations have extensive, successful experience in completing similar types of projects. Any previous CALFED related contracts are being (or have been) successfully executed.				X		
	Medium: Organization of staff and participant organizations is clear. Responsibilities of individuals and organizations are identified for technical, administrative, and management roles. Biosketches are provided that indicate acceptable levels of expertise for the project. Potential conflicts of interest are disclosed.						
	Low: Organization of staff or participant organizations is not clear. Individual responsibilities not defined. Information is incomplete. Significant, or undisclosed, conflicts of interest exist.						